

Appl. No. 10/668,139
Amdt. dated April 25, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed January 25, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14-17, and 25-28 are pending in this application. Claims 12 and 13 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the allowability of claims 1, 2, and 4-8, and the allowability of the subject matter of claims 10, 11, and 14-17, if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the following comments.

In the Office Action, claims 9 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos.: 3,572,709 to Risher ("Risher '709"); 5,624,330 to Tsuchida ("Tsuchida '330"), 5,711,721 to Johnson ("Johnson '721"), and 5,797,806 to Butler ("Butler '806").

For economy of prosecution, Applicants have canceled claims 3, 9-11, 14, and 18-28, and added claims 29-31 by this Amendment. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections on the claims 15-17, for the reasons set forth below.

New Claims 29-31

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new independent claims 29-31. New independent claim 29 is substantially similar to claim 10 written in independent form. New claim 29 should be allowable for the same reasons claim 10 is allowable if written in independent form. Specifically, as recited by the Examiner, "none of the prior art discloses or renders as obvious an annular ridge to cooperate with an annular recess of a hosel, corresponding surfaces configured to engage each other in an interlocking fit that inhibits axial rotation."

New independent claim 30 is substantially similar to claim 11 written in independent form. New claim 30 should be allowable for the same reasons claim 11 is allowable if written in independent form. Specifically, as recited by the Examiner, "none of the prior art discloses or renders as obvious an upper portion including a plurality of protrusions."

New independent claim 31 is substantially similar to claim 14 written in independent form. New claim 31 should be allowable for the same reasons claim 14 is allowable

Appl. No. 10/668,139
Amdt. dated April 25, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed January 25, 2006

if written in independent form. Specifically, as recited by the Examiner, "none of the prior art discloses or renders as obvious a longitudinal rib on an interior surface of a ferrule and a corresponding groove on the outer surface of a hosel."

No new matter has been added by these claims.

Claims 15-17

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that dependent claims 15-17 would be allowable if written in independent form. Applicants have amended claim 15 to depend from new independent claim 31. Therefore, dependent claims 15-17 depend from new claim 31, and should be allowable for the same reasons that claim 31 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing amendments and remarks should place this application in condition for allowance. If any matters remain outstanding after consideration of this Amendment that the Examiner believes might be expedited by a telephone conference with Applicants' undersigned representative, he is respectfully requested to call at the number indicated below.

Date: April 25, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

By: 

James R. Brueggemann
Registration No. 78,286

333 South Hope Street, 48th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 620-1780 x4156
Facsimile: (213) 620-1398